

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
COLLEGE OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY**

[Effective Fall 2025]

The College of Health and Human Services (CHHS) and its faculty are committed to providing high quality instruction, research and other scholarly and creative activities, and service to their constituents. Furthermore, the CHHS promotes continued professional growth of faculty in teaching, research and other scholarly and creative activities, and service to the university, profession, and the community. With these goals in mind, the college establishes this policy for the evaluation of tenured and probationary faculty members eligible for reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP). Evaluation of faculty at all levels of review shall take into consideration the diversity of expertise within the CHHS and recognize this diversity as a source of strength that enables the college to grow in stature.

In this College RTP Policy, portions of the University RTP Policy (Policy Statement 23-24) that are critical for clarity and emphasis are included. All University RTP Policy insertions in the College RTP Policy are presented in *italics* to distinguish clearly between the language of the University and College policies. Portions of the University RTP Policy not inserted are referenced by the section number used in the University Policy.

1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1.1 Mission and Vision

California State University, Long Beach is a diverse, student-centered, globally-engaged public university committed to providing highly valued undergraduate and graduate educational opportunities through superior teaching; research, scholarly and creative activities (RSCA); and service for the people of California and the world. CSULB envisions changing lives by expanding educational opportunities, championing creativity, and preparing leaders for a changing world. In service to the university's mission, the CHHS aims to convene and partner with the communities we serve to transform lives and advance health and human services. The mission of the CHHS is to cultivate a supportive and inclusive environment that promotes the success of diverse students, faculty, and staff through high impact student-centered learning, innovative research and scholarship, and service that improve the quality of life and holistic wellbeing of all the communities.

1.2 Guiding Principles of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

A faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service is essential to accomplishing the articulated mission and vision of both the university and the college.

1.2.1 *Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions to the academic unit (e.g., school, department, or program), college, university, community, and the profession.¹ In concurrence with University RTP policy, the CHHS RTP policy provides clear expectations and limits the potential for bias, while also allowing for flexibility to recognize the unique contributions of individual faculty and the context of individual disciplines.*

1.2.2 *RTP decisions must be clear, fair, and unbiased at all levels. Decisions regarding RTP are among the most important made by our university community. Faculty achievements may differ from those of colleagues yet still meet the standards for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. The RTP process must ensure that excellence will be rewarded and that faculty members who meet academic unit, college, and university standards and expectations will advance.*

1.2.3 Faculty members shall be evaluated on the quality of their achievements and the impact of their contributions over the period of review in: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) RSCA; 3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession. All faculty members will be evaluated on the basis of all three areas.

1.2.4 This policy should not be construed as preventing innovation or adjustment in workload (with respect to teaching, RSCA, or service) based upon faculty expertise and accomplishment; academic unit and college needs; and university mission.

1.2.5 All faculty members are expected to demonstrate positive qualities that reflect favorably on the individual, the department/academic unit, the college, and the university. These qualities include high standards of professional, collegial, and ethical behavior. These standards are articulated in Academic Senate policy.

1.3 CHHS Values

1.3.1 The criteria in this policy are intended to embody the following values of the college:

Integrity

Students, faculty, and staff in the College of Health and Human Services act with integrity. We adhere to policy, accept responsibility for actions, and promote inclusion, communication, respect for others and divergent views, honesty, and fairness.

Growth Mindset

¹ In concurrence with University policy, where “department” is used in this text it is intended to refer to academic units with separate RTP policies (e.g., departments, schools or programs).

Students, faculty, and staff in the College of Health and Human Services believe that individual and collective talents can be developed through hard work, persistence, good strategies, and input from others.

Collaboration

The College of Health and Human Services supports interdisciplinary collaboration among faculty, students, and our community to stimulate and foster excellence in education and research innovation, responsiveness to pressing health and human services problems, and the growth of existing partnerships and the development of new ones.

Innovation

The College of Health and Human Services conducts research to advance the education of our students and the multiple academic disciplines that comprise the college. We aim to increase understanding, discover scientific breakthroughs, and enhance the communities we serve.

DEIA Statement

In addition, the CHHS celebrates the diversity of students, faculty, and staff. This policy is intended to embody the college's commitment to amplifying diverse voices in our classrooms, research endeavors, and administrative decisions. As a college, the CHHS believes in equal access and opportunity for all, and works tirelessly to eliminate barriers that hinder success, whether those barriers are related to race, ethnicity, age, gender, sexual orientation, disability, religious affiliation, socioeconomic status, or any other aspect of identity. The college is therefore committed to providing an inclusive environment where everyone feels a sense of belonging, where everyone's perspectives are valued, and where we can all thrive academically, personally, and professionally.

1.3.2 Alignment with University Values

CHHS values diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility. All college and department RTP policies should reflect these values. *CSULB recognizes that cultural and identity taxation has the potential to create inequities within all faculty evaluation areas. This policy and all college and department RTP policies should be structured and interpreted in ways that minimize these inequities.*

1.4 Governing Documents

1.4.1 The college adopts this document pursuant to the mandate of Section 3.5 of the university RTP Policy (Policy Statement 23-24) and in accordance with the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). If any provision of this document conflicts with any provision within the CBA or the university RTP Policy, the conflicting provision shall be severed from the rest of this document, deemed void, and thereby rendered

inoperable.

1.4.2 Academic units (e.g., departments or schools) within the college shall adopt RTP policies that elaborate on discipline-specific standards in all areas of evaluation. The standards adopted at the academic-unit level shall be equivalent to or higher than university-level or college-level standards. If any provision of an academic unit RTP Policy conflicts with any provision within the CBA, the university RTP Policy, or the RTP policy of the CHHS, the specific conflicting provision shall be severed from the rest of the academic unit's RTP Policy, deemed void, and thereby rendered inoperable.

1.4.3 Collectively, the RTP policies of the university, college, and academic unit shall be used to assess candidates' performance through the stages of their academic progress.

1.5 Obligations

All participants in the RTP process are expected to comply with the policies set forth in the university, college, and academic unit RTP policies.. Faculty can receive a personnel action of non-retained for not submitting a tenure file during a review period.

1.6 Standards

RTP committee recommendations and those of chairs and directors of academic units are intended to evaluate evidence of a candidate's strengths and weaknesses associated with each of the established standards, not just merely restate or summarize the candidate's narrative. Evaluation(s) shall include an analysis of the candidate's role, performance, and achievement within the academic unit. Evaluation(s) of a candidate's record must be guided by the principle that the higher the academic rank, the greater the expectation for demonstrated excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service.

1.7 Profiles of Academic Ranks

RTP candidates shall be evaluated by applying specific criteria established by each department (academic unit). The university and college RTP policies profile the standards applicable to each academic rank. The RTP policy of each department (academic unit) applies these standards by using appropriate discipline-specific criteria.

1.8 Narrative

In order to present their achievements in the most coherent intellectual and professional context, candidates are required to present a written narrative describing their work in each of the categories to be evaluated. The narrative is intended to serve as a guide to reviewers in understanding the faculty member's professional achievements.

2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

As indicated in the University RTP Policy (Policy Statement 23-24), *college, departments, and other academic units are responsible for defining further the standards of excellence and accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion in their various disciplines, consistent with the mission and needs of both the university and the college. RTP standards and criteria shall articulate expectations for faculty accomplishments in all three areas of evaluation: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service and engagement at the university, in the community, and in the profession. The department must develop and articulate specific standards and criteria to be applied in the evaluation of candidates in all three areas of evaluation. Department standards must match or may exceed all college-level standards. Department RTP policies must be consistent with respective college and university RTP policies.*

2.1 Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities

Faculty members in CHHS are expected to demonstrate that they are effective teachers. Instruction and instructionally related activities include teaching and fostering learning inside and outside the traditional classroom. Instructionally related activities include, but are not limited to: curriculum and course development; academic and academic-unit advising; supervision of student research, fieldwork, laboratory work; supervision of students in clinical settings; direction of student performances and exhibitions; and related activities involving student learning and student engagement. Additional instructional activities may include, but are not limited to: mentoring students; taking students abroad for academic and cultural study; and supervising students in the production of theses, projects, and other capstone experiences. *Colleges and departments should make clear where faculty members must disclose and describe any instructional activities for which they receive reassigned time.*

CSULB recognizes that effective instruction is as much a process as an outcome, and available strategies may be affected by mode, level, and type of instruction. CSULB also recognizes the additional faculty time and effort required to provide expansive learning opportunities for students such as High Impact Practices.

Excellent teaching involves a commitment to three principles that candidates are expected to address in their narratives:

- *continuous professional learning,*
- *thoughtful reflection on and subsequent adaptation of instruction (formative assessment), and*
- *the use of instructional practices that foster student learning and the achievement of course goals (summative assessment).*

Department RTP policies should further delineate or specify instructional activities, the kinds and amount of supporting evidence candidates may submit, as well as include other examples of supporting evidence.

departments should employ multiple modes of evidence when assessing teaching effectiveness and must not rely significantly on student-perceptions-of-teaching forms

as evidence.

2.1.1 Continuous Professional Learning

Effective instructors remain up to date not only with their course content, but also pedagogical practices designed to help all students achieve course learning goals. Effective instruction requires that faculty members engage in professional development activities associated with educating a diverse student population.

Within their narratives, candidates should discuss (and committees should consider) what they have invested in their own learning and growth as instructors.

Within their supporting documentation, candidates should provide evidence documenting this professional learning. Evidence supporting the narrative could include, but is not limited to, participation in on or off campus professional development activities, conferences, and lessons learned observing or discussing the instruction of peers.

2.1.2 Reflection & Instructional Adaptation: Formative Assessment

Effective instruction requires that faculty members reflect on their teaching practices and the impact of those practices on student learning. Effective teaching is thoughtful teaching. Deliberate efforts to improve instructional effectiveness are expected of all faculty members. Effective instructors are aware of their instructional goals, formatively assess students, reflect upon the information gathered, and change their instructional practices if the assessment results indicate the need to do so.

Within their narratives, candidates should discuss (and the committees should consider) their formative assessment practices, including: (1) discussion of one or more course goals, aims, or practices the candidate decided to change, (2) the evidence alerting the candidate something needed to change, and (3) how the candidate ultimately decided the course(s) would change.

Evidence supporting the narrative could include but is not limited to evidence that prompted the changes, and documents such as syllabi, assignments, or other materials that show what the course was like before and after the changes. This could also include evidence generated from taking part in faculty development initiatives at the college or university level. CHHS values culturally responsive teaching and encourages faculty to undertake professional development to advance culturally relevant pedagogical strategies that focus on student-centered practices of setting high expectations, honoring different communication styles and practicing critical consciousness that values student agency and input.

2.1.3 Instructional Practices that Foster Learning: Summative Assessment

Effective instruction engages and helps students learn the desired course outcomes.

Instructional methods should be consistent with course/curriculum goals and should accommodate student differences.

Within their narratives, candidates should discuss (and committees should consider) effective instructional strategies for student learning.

Evidence supporting the narrative could include but is not limited to student work samples (including multiple iterations of the same assignment with instructor feedback), assessments, syllabi, peer observations, a short video clip of the candidate's teaching together with a narrative description, observations by trained observers, support letters, qualitative or quantitative student perception data, and other supporting documentation.

2.1.4 Student Learning Outcomes

Instructional practices and course materials shall clearly convey to students expected student outcomes and learning goals. Assessment methods should align with instructional practices. Where candidates have made improvements to outcomes, goals, and/or assessments, these should be discussed in the narrative by the candidate with corresponding evidence.

2.1.5 Syllabi

Course syllabi shall be included in the candidate's RTP file and align with academic unit RTP Policy. Syllabi for all courses taught during the review period shall be included in the candidate's file, along with narrative discussion and corresponding evidence where improvements have been made to syllabi.

2.1.6 Grade Distributions

Grade distributions of courses taught during the review period should be included in the candidate's RTP file along with narrative discussion of grading in accordance with academic unit expectations. Grade distributions alone do not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness and, as such, candidates should specify why and how teaching strategies inform their grade distributions.

2.1.7 Student Response to Instruction

Student course evaluations alone do not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness, and utilization of the university standard evaluation form is only one method of presenting student response to instruction. Nevertheless, student course evaluations shall be used by the College RTP committee to evaluate student response to instruction, among other evidence. Candidates shall submit student evaluations in accordance with academic unit expectations. All quantitative data from student course evaluations during the review period shall be included in the candidate's file. Candidates should demonstrate in their narrative deliberate efforts to improve instruction based on student course evaluations.

2.1.8 Peer Evaluations

Peer evaluations of the candidate's instruction are important sources of evidence that may be included in the candidate's RTP file, and candidates should reflect on and incorporate peer feedback, including providing evidence of instructional improvements where appropriate. The quantity of peer evaluations, as well as the rank of evaluators, shall be determined by the candidate's academic unit and followed accordingly. Evidence demonstrating peer evaluations could include (but are not limited to) formative feedback activities, peer evaluations of different types of courses and their modalities (e.g., face-to-face, hybrid, or online), and the completion of evaluation forms approved by the candidate's academic unit. CHHS values growth mindset for faculty in terms of continuous quality improvement for teaching. Academic units should provide evaluation forms to both reviewers and faculty being reviewed that are aligned with CHHS values as well as being reflective of the type of course under evaluation. This could include different evaluation forms for different types of classes (e.g., labs, clinical, activity and lecturer courses). Evaluators are encouraged to use evaluative statements in their assessment of classroom performance and activities.

2.2 Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA)

In accordance with University policy, CHHS faculty engage in a variety of valuable scholarly and creative activities. Because academic disciplines vary in the meaning, scope, and practice of research, scholarly and creative activities (RSCA), the College RTP policy can only provide a guiding framework for candidates and committees engaged in evaluating scholarly work. Departments should develop their own definitions, standards, and criteria for the evaluation of RSCA, including examples of specific accomplishments. These definitions, standards, and criteria should value scholarly contributions which create, apply, or expand knowledge or skills benefiting professional, local, state, national, or international communities.

2.2.1 Variability Across Disciplines

Evaluation criteria should recognize that faculty engage in individual and collaborative RSCA, valuing work not only within but also across and between disciplines. Criteria should align with the mission and values discussed in section 1, including the importance of involving students in RSCA.

The value of these products is not determined by their medium, language, or audience. Valuable scholarly and creative activities are not restricted to professional audiences, English-only contributions, or historically valued publishing mechanisms. Valuable contributions, however, must have been evaluated by expert scholars or practitioners in the field.

Academic disciplines vary in the meaning, scope, and practice of RSCA. Consistent with University expectations of all faculty members, RTP candidates within the CHHS must demonstrate achievements in research and scholarly/creative activities. These achievements must be consistent with both the standards contained in this Policy and the discipline-specific criteria established in the RTP policies of their respective departments. When developing such policies, departments shall incorporate the standards specified below in subsections 2.2.2 and 2.2.3.

Consistent with variability across the disciplines, departments may establish tables of equivalency for RSCA products and output for tenure and promotion to associate professor. Such tables of equivalency are recognized by the college as important for allowing disciplinary flexibility for candidates. Tables of equivalency should be explicitly articulated in departmental policies. Candidates should directly address where they have made equivalency substitutions, consistent with their department policies, in their narratives.

2.2.2 RSCA

*RSCA acceptable for reappointment, tenure, or promotion can take any of several forms. Examples below **should not** be construed as exhaustive or recommended:*

- *Scholarship of Discovery: Advancing knowledge through original research, scholarship, and creative activities. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to peer reviewed publications, juried presentations, performances or exhibitions in notable venues, or patents.*
- *Scholarship of Integration: RSCA that seeks to build or expand connections from existing knowledge within or across disciplines, to shape more critical, coherent, and/or integrated use of knowledge. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to published literature reviews, textbooks, or meta-analyses.*
- *Scholarship of Application or Engagement: RSCA involving the application of disciplinary expertise to practical problems within or outside of the university. The Scholarship of Engagement includes: a reciprocal relationship with communities that yields innovations with disciplinary expertise, can be replicated, documented, is professionally and/ or peer-reviewed, and has evidence of impact. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to technical reports, program evaluations, grant proposals, or mentorship of students in RSCA activities.*
- *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: RSCA advancing teaching and learning knowledge through systematic study. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to, educational research disseminated via professional journals or conferences, publishing a new instructional method, or grant proposals supporting instructional activities.*

Academic units **should not limit** candidates to an exclusive list of RSCA activities or

accomplishments but may develop equivalencies for RSCA activities in accordance with disciplinary norms and expectations. *Candidates bear ultimate responsibility for documenting the quality, impact, and extent to which their accomplishments use or expand disciplinary knowledge or skills* based on requirements delineated the department.

Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions of substance in RSCA throughout their careers. All faculty members are expected to produce quality RSCA achievements that contribute to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the discipline or interdisciplinary studies.

Within their narratives, candidates should discuss (and committees should consider) their scholarly vision or program--the questions, issues, or problems guiding their work and aims or expected outcomes of their work. They should discuss the work's trajectory and evolution, as well as describe why the selected activities are high quality, relevant, or impactful within their fields. The narrative is not meant to be merely a list of activities and candidates are not expected to discuss every accomplishment.

Candidates are encouraged to refer readers to supporting documents without repeating their contents. The text should be written to be understandable by colleagues outside their fields. In addition, candidates must disclose and describe any scholarly or creative activities for which they receive reassigned time or additional compensation.

2.2.3 Dissemination of RSCA

In all cases, RSCA involves the dissemination of products or findings. In their RTP policies, academic units shall explain their disciplinary norms and standards for the dissemination and production of RSCA as well as specific criteria for evaluating the quantity and quality of candidates' RSCA contributions.

Peer-reviewed publication of scholarly and creative works or equivalent is required of all candidates. The RTP policy of each academic unit shall detail the unit's specific publication requirements, specifying the minimum required at each level of review. In addition, each department shall provide equivalencies that may count in lieu of scholarly publications, given disciplinary standards.

Possible research products that may be counted in lieu of a departmentally defined number of scholarly publications include:

Conference proceedings, presentations, and grants (submitted, funded, and unfunded) and book chapters. Each academic unit should identify the research products from their respective disciplines that strengthen a candidate's scholarly portfolio for reappointment, tenure, and promotion to any rank. It is the responsibility of each academic unit within the college to explicitly identify research products and how they will be evaluated. It is also the responsibility of the academic unit how RSCA activities for which assigned time or additional compensation received are evaluated. Units should explicitly draw a distinction between internal assigned time, such as that provided by internal funds from the Office of Research and Economic Development, as either a faculty small grant, assigned time, or a summer stipend/mini grant, and assigned time provided by external grants and contracts. For any internal RSCA funding, the unit must provide details about what documentation is required for faculty accountability to count the RSCA product.

It is the candidate's responsibility to explicitly identify any internal and externally funded research activities and deliverables. In their narratives the candidates must disclose

and describe the details of the RSCA activities and how they have demonstrated accountability to the funding entity, whether internal or external. For collaborative works, the candidate must articulate their contributions and how they are distinguished from the efforts of others on the research team.

Academic units should also explicitly identify how and to what extent or in what ways research mentoring of students is used to strengthen the candidate's file. Expectations for student mentoring, if any, need to be provided. It is the candidate's responsibility to identify research outcomes related to student research mentoring.

2.3 Service

Academic service is vital to universities as centers for public good. Faculty service benefits students, the university, the wider community, and the academic profession and strengthens shared governance processes. Universities cannot and should not function without faculty service contributions. Therefore, service contributions should not be minimized or considered less important than instruction or RSCA by candidates or evaluators. It is the responsibility of every tenure-track and tenured faculty member to engage in service, and to do so in a way that potentially leads to equitable contributions that minimize cultural and identity taxation.

All tenure-track and tenured faculty members are expected to participate in the collegial processes of shared governance on campus and to maintain active engagement benefitting the university, community, and/or profession through high-quality service contributions and activities throughout their careers.

Service work acceptable for reappointment, tenure, or promotion can take any of several forms. Although this document broadly categorizes service activities in terms of impact on campus, community, or profession, these designations are neither discrete nor mutually exclusive. Some forms of service may be informal, while others may be through structured roles. The following examples should not be construed as exhaustive:

- *Campus Service: Service and leadership on department, college, university, CSU systemwide committees and task forces; oversight and maintenance of departmental labs, facilities, and supervision of student workers; service to student organizations; service to CFA.*
- *Community Service: Board memberships; consulting with agencies in areas relevant to academic expertise.*
- *Service to the Profession: External grant reviewer; peer-reviewer for*

scholarly publications; leadership for professional organizations; mentoring, coaching, and advising of colleagues and students in the discipline.

Departments must make clear to candidates the types of service appropriate to faculty rank, experience, and course load. In no case shall departments limit candidates to an exclusive list of service activities or accomplishments necessary for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. Differential workloads may result in varied service expectations.

Department criteria should recognize not only quantity of service activity but also its quality and duration. Evaluation criteria should also consider the value and impact of each candidate's service activities. Departments may decide to emphasize balanced service across campus, community, and profession. All faculty, however, are expected to contribute to shared governance activities on campus.

As noted in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), mentoring, advising, and outreach activities, including those caused by cultural and identity taxation, are particularly important for supporting underserved, first-generation, international, and/or underrepresented students. Service activities like these (whether academic or personal, supporting faculty or students), may be difficult for candidates to document in conventional ways. Department policy should specify the evaluation criteria and the process to recognize their importance and guide candidates on necessary levels of evidence to document these activities.

Department evaluation criteria should also be based on recognition that service to the community or profession should connect to candidates' academic expertise and professional goals. Departments are encouraged to outline criteria that acknowledge work done in support of diversity, equity, inclusion, and access, on campus and off campus as well as in support of racial and social justice, including for instance the elimination of anti-Blackness more broadly. Candidates, in turn, are encouraged to document work done in this regard.

Insofar as the University and CHHS recognize that cultural and identity taxation have the potential to create inequities within all faculty evaluation areas, service done on behalf of students or on behalf of the department, college and university that might otherwise go unrecognized or disproportionately fall on faculty should be considered in the evaluation process. While all tenure-track and tenured faculty members are expected to participate in shared governance and maintain active engagement, evaluation committees at the academic unit and college levels should consider the role cultural and identity taxation plays in the service activities of faculty. These activities could include, but are not limited to, mentoring students or supervising student clubs

that might not constitute formal committee work, but still take up considerable time. Moreover, academic units should consider ways to minimize these inequities by proactively working with faculty, prior to undergoing review, to ensure equitable distribution of service. Candidates are encouraged to discuss and document in their materials any service activities they feel may have been disproportionately completed in light of cultural and identity taxation.

Most faculty engage in service activities within their respective departments and/or academic units. The various committees within each department and the roles (chair, versus member) greatly differ within each department of the college. Departments must outline what committees, roles, and types of service are appropriate to each action (reappointment, tenure, Associate Professor, Full Professor) and the types of documentation that candidates must include to substantiate the service commitments. It is recognized that many service roles are not strictly “service” in the sense of being voluntary commitments for which no assigned time/release from teaching is given. Academic units must also specify how service activities that receive assigned time are evaluated **and what service is required by candidates at all levels in addition to service activities for which assigned time is provided.**

It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide documentation of service roles, and the time commitment given their various committee assignments within each committee.

Within their narratives, candidates must disclose and describe whenever activities include reassigned time or compensation, including details about the expectations or goals of the service activity. In general, candidates should discuss service activities by outlining the activity's objectives or actions (for instance, what a committee does and how often it meets), articulate their own contributions to the work accomplished (for instance, officer/leadership roles and concrete contributions such as drafts of memos or policies), and then describe outcomes or impact of the work. Student mentoring or advising (when being considered as service) could be described in terms of its goals, aims, or philosophy, followed by discussion of the scope (e.g., numbers of students, extent of work) and impact of the candidate's work, highlighting student success. Candidates can describe off-campus or profession-linked work in terms of what the work is, how it utilizes the candidate's academic expertise, and how it impacts the profession or wider community. In general, candidates should discuss and (when possible) document the importance, scope, and length of their service accomplishments, noting the time, effort, and amount of work involved in the activities as well as (when possible) the overall impact of the service and the number of individuals impacted.

Candidates should describe, and department should recognize and take into account as part of the service workload activities supporting our diverse student population, including underserved, first- generation, and/or underrepresented students.

2.4 Evaluation for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion to Associate Professor

A candidate becomes eligible for tenure and promotion to associate in the sixth year of rank at assistant professor. Candidates should describe how they have met all requirements related to each area of evaluation in the narrative with supporting evidence.

2.5 Evaluation of Tenured Faculty for Promotion

An Associate Professor becomes eligible for promotion review to the rank of Professor in the fifth year at the associate rank. A tenured Associate Professor, however, may opt to seek early promotion to the rank of Professor prior to the fifth year in rank in accordance with the provisions of Section 5.5. Standards for promotion to Full Professor for faculty shall be higher than those for Associate Professor. Candidates should describe how they have met all requirements related to each area of evaluation, it is important to note that the criteria for promotion to Full must be higher than promotion to associate, in the narrative with supporting evidence since achieving tenure.

A tenured faculty member may choose not to be evaluated for promotion in a given year; however, the faculty member will still be required to undergo the five-year periodic evaluation of tenured faculty as outlined in relevant Academic Senate policy documents and CBA.

2.5.1 Variability Across the Disciplines

Promotion to Full Professor in CHHS represents the highest level of academic achievement. Candidates for this rank are expected to demonstrate achievement in all three areas of RSCA, Teaching, and Service. While excellence in all three areas is required, we want to emphasize the variability across our diverse disciplines within the college.

Consistent with variability across the disciplines, departments may establish tables of equivalency for RSCA products and output for promotion to full professor. Such tables of equivalency are recognized by the college as important for allowing disciplinary flexibility for candidates. Tables of equivalency should be explicitly articulated in departmental policies. Candidates should directly address where they have made equivalency substitutions, consistent with their department policies, in their narratives.

When considering equivalency of RSCA products, the standards for promotion to full professor must exceed the standards for tenure and promotion to associate professor.

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS

Participants in the RTP process include the candidate, the department RTP committee, the department chair, the college RTP committee, the Dean, the Provost, and the President. In addition, there may be external reviewers participating in the RTP process.

For details on conducting external evaluations, see the Academic Senate policy on external evaluations.

The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) allows faculty, students, academic administrators, and the President to provide information concerning the candidate during the open period.

Deliberations on reappointment, tenure, and promotion shall be confidential. Access to materials and recommendations pertaining to the candidate shall be limited to the RTP candidate, the department RTP committee, the department chair, the college RTP committee, the dean, the Provost, Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel (as an appropriate administrator), and the President (see CBA). In addition, external reviewers, if any, will have access to appropriate materials for evaluation.

3.1 Candidate

A candidate for RTP should make every effort to seek advice and guidance from the department chair, and it is highly recommended to consult with mentors, the college dean, and/or the appropriate University resources, particularly regarding the RTP process and procedures and how criteria and standards are applied. Candidates are also encouraged to use additional trainings and resources offered by the college, the University, and the California Faculty Association (CFA). Candidates have the primary responsibility for collecting and presenting the evidence of their accomplishments. The candidate's documentation must include all required information and supporting materials. The candidate should clearly reference and explain all supporting materials.

The candidate shall submit a narrative that describes goals and accomplishments during the period of review, including a clear description of the quality and significance of contributions to the three areas of review: 1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service to the university, community, and/or profession. The candidate shall provide all required supplemental documentation, including summary sheets from student evaluations and an index of all supplementary materials. The candidate shall provide all prior RTP reviews and periodic evaluations over the full review period, including candidate's responses or rebuttals, if any.

3.2 Department RTP Policy

The department must develop and articulate specific standards and criteria to be applied in the evaluation of candidates in all three areas of evaluation. Department standards must match or may exceed all college-level standards. Department RTP policies must be consistent with respective college and university RTP policies.

The department RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenure-track and tenured department faculty members and to approval by the college faculty council, the dean, and the provost. Department RTP policies shall be subject to regular review by the department's tenure-track and tenured faculty.

3.3 Department RTP Committee

The department RTP committee has the primary responsibility for evaluating the candidate's work and makes the initial recommendation to the college RTP committee regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Department RTP committee members are responsible for evaluating the candidate's performance by applying the criteria of the department.

The tenure-track and tenured faculty of a department elect representatives to the department's RTP committee. The Collective Bargaining Agreement restricts membership on RTP committees to tenured, full-time faculty members. The CBA also states that faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may serve on RTP committees if requested by the majority vote of tenure-track and tenured faculty members of the department and approved by the President. However, RTP committees may not be made up solely of faculty participating in the FERP.

No single individual may participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review. It is strongly recommended that RTP committee members attend RTP evaluation workshops and be familiar with the latest policies and evaluation guidelines at the Department, College, and University levels.

Within each academic unit (e.g., department or school), all RTP recommendations shall be considered by the same committee. However, there may be different committees for different kinds of RTP matters. For example, one committee comprised of three faculty members at the rank of Associate Professor might consider all candidates within the academic unit who are eligible for reappointment, tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. A second committee comprised of three faculty members with the rank of Professor might consider only candidates eligible for promotion to the rank of Professor.

The initial responsibility to ensure compliance with RTP policies and deadlines rests with the candidate. Candidates are expected to furnish necessary and relevant evidence to support their applications, and to provide this information in accordance with established deadlines.

3.3.1 Prohibition on Multiple Levels of RTP Review

A faculty unit employee shall not serve on more than one (1) committee level of peer review.

3.3.2 Ad Hoc Committees

If fewer than the required number of members, as specified in the academic unit RTP policy or this document, are eligible from the academic unit, then additional members from outside the academic unit shall be selected in accordance with the following procedure:

(a) Nominees may be from any school or college within the university provided that they have some familiarity with the RTP candidate's discipline or area of expertise.

(b) After prospective nominees have granted their permission to stand for election to an ad-hoc RTP Committee, the academic unit shall submit the names of all candidates for election to the unit's RTP committee and then conduct an election. All tenure-track and tenured faculty members in a department will be eligible to vote.

3.3.3 Joint Appointments

Joint appointments shall be evaluated by a committee composed of members of each academic unit served by the person being evaluated. The joint-appointment RTP committee shall be composed of members currently elected to each academic unit's RTP committee. This committee shall use the existing criteria of each academic unit to evaluate the individual holding joint appointment pursuant to item VI, Academic Senate Policy.

3.4 Department Chair

The department chair is responsible for communicating the department, college, and university policies to candidates. The chair also provides ongoing guidance to candidates as to whether their performance is consistent with department expectations. The chair, in collaboration with college or department mentors, is responsible for talking with candidates about their overall career development and providing professional mentoring. The chair shall meet with the department RTP committee prior to the beginning of the department evaluation process to review the department, college, and university processes and procedures.

Department chairs may write independent evaluations of all RTP candidates unless the department chair is elected to the department RTP committee. However, in promotion considerations, a department chair must have a higher rank than the candidate being considered for promotion in order to contribute a review or participate on a review committee. In no case may a department chair participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review.

3.5 College RTP Policy

The college RTP policy must specify in writing the standards to be applied in evaluating candidates in all three areas of evaluation, consistent with the university RTP policy. The college RTP policy must ensure consistency of standards across the college. Colleges have the responsibility for setting forth the standards appropriate to the breadth of disciplines in the college.

The college RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenure-track and tenured college faculty members and to approval by the dean and the provost. College RTP policy shall be subject to regular review by the tenure-track and tenured faculty of the college.

3.6 College RTP Committee

The college RTP committee reviews the materials submitted by the candidate as well as the department RTP committee and department chair evaluations and

recommendations. The college RTP committee evaluates the candidate's file in accordance with standards established in the department, college, and university RTP policies. The college RTP committee must ensure that fair and consistent evaluation occurs at the department and college levels according to the standards set by the department and college RTP documents. The college RTP committee must take into serious account the department's specific standards for evaluating the candidate. It is strongly recommended that RTP committee members attend RTP evaluation workshops and be familiar with the latest policies and evaluation guidelines at the Department, College, and University levels.

The college committee prepares and forwards an independent recommendation to the college dean.

3.6.1 Duties

The college RTP committee shall conduct evaluations of all candidates' files and shall include a recommendation to the college Dean.

3.6.2 Membership

The college RTP committee shall consist of eight (8) tenured, full-time faculty members. A minimum of five (5) faculty members must hold the rank of Full Professor. Up to three (3) tenured, full-time faculty members may serve at the rank of Associate Professor.

Only tenured Full Professors may vote on applications for promotion to the rank of Full Professor.

3.6.3 Election, Service, Appointment, and Terms

(a) Annually, each department shall be invited to nominate from its membership one professor and an associate professor to the dean of the College during their first/second department meeting. Members of the college committee shall be elected by secret ballot of the college faculty;

(b) There shall not be more than one member from any one academic unit; an exception may occur and a second member from the same department can be elected only after all academic units are represented from the eligibility pool;

(c) Elected members shall serve staggered, two-year terms;

(d) Members shall not serve more than two consecutive two-year terms (i.e., more than four consecutive years). After serving four consecutive years in any capacity (e.g., alternate), an individual is ineligible to serve the following year in any capacity.

(e) A faculty unit employee shall not serve on more than one (1) committee of peer review.

(f) A faculty member participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may serve on the RTP Committee (one-year term at a time) if approved by the majority of the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the department and approved by the President. However, in no cases will the RTP committee consist of faculty members all of whom, or the majority of whom, are FERP participants.

3.6.4 Vacancies

In the event that one or more vacancies occur in unexpired terms of the college RTP committee, either a meeting of the college faculty shall be called for the purpose of securing nominations, or nominations shall be solicited via a nominating ballot executed by the office of the Dean of the college. If there are unexpired terms of differing lengths, the nominee(s) who receive(s) the most votes shall serve the longest term(s).

3.6.5 Chair

A chair shall be elected from among the members of the college RTP committee.

3.6.6 Review and Evaluation of Candidates' Files

(a) The college RTP committee shall evaluate all candidates' files in accordance with standards established in the RTP policies of the academic unit, the college, and the university.

(b) The college RTP committee shall take into serious account the academic unit's specific standards for evaluating the candidate.

(c) The college committee shall prepare and forward an independent, written evaluation to the college Dean concerning each RTP candidate. The evaluation must conclude with a personnel action recommendation in accordance with the provisions of Section 3.6.7 of this document.

3.6.7 Recommendations

(a) For all candidates seeking reappointment or tenure, the college RTP committee shall review the recommendation of the applicable academic unit as part of its evaluation of the candidate and recommend whether reappointment or tenure should be granted or denied.

(b) For all candidates seeking promotion, the college RTP committee shall review the recommendation of the applicable academic unit and make a positive or negative recommendation with respect to the proposed action.

(c) The college RTP committee shall forward to the Dean the entire candidate file, including its own evaluations and recommendations and those from the academic unit.

(d) The college committee shall inform all candidates of the committee's recommendation in writing.

3.7 Dean of the College

The dean has a unique role to play in providing oversight and guidance in the RTP process within the college. The dean mentors department chairs regarding their role in the RTP process, encourages departments to develop and clarify their expectations for faculty performance, provides clear guidance to the college RTP committee, facilitates mechanisms for guiding/mentoring candidates in the RTP process, and ensures that all evaluations are carried out in accordance with department, college, and university policies. The dean ensures that standards across the college are maintained.

The dean of the college shall review the candidate's file, including all prior evaluations, and provide an independent recommendation to the provost based upon the three areas of evaluation listed earlier.

3.8 Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

The provost provides oversight for the university's RTP process, establishes the annual calendar of the RTP cycle, provides training for committees, chairs, and deans, and distributes relevant information to prospective candidates, chairs, deans, and members of college and department RTP committees.

The provost shall review the candidate's file, including all prior evaluations, and make a final recommendation.

3.9 President

The President has the authority to make final decisions for the university with respect to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The President may delegate this authority to the provost.

4.0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

The CHHS RTP Policy follows the timeline designated by the University Policy (see sections 4.0-4.3 of Policy Statement 23-24).

5.0 REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION CRITERIA

The CHHS RTP Policy follows the reappointment and promotion criteria designated by the University Policy (see sections 5.0-5.5.2 of Policy Statement 23-24). In particular, this policy aligns with the University Policy on early tenure and/or early promotion, as noted below:

5.5 Early Tenure or Early Promotion

A potential candidate should receive initial guidance from the department chair and dean regarding the criteria and expectations for early tenure and early promotion. Early tenure and early promotion are granted only in exceptional circumstances and for compelling reasons. Assistant professors may apply for early promotion, early tenure, or both. Tenured associate professors may apply for early promotion to full professor. However, non-tenured associate professors may not apply for early promotion to full professor without also seeking early tenure.

5.5.1 Early Tenure

Early tenure may be granted in exceptional cases when a candidate demonstrates a record of distinction in all three areas of evaluation that clearly exceeds in substantial ways the requirements in department policies. Departments must make clear what qualifies as exceeding in substantial ways. The candidate's record must inspire

confidence that the pattern of strong overall performance will continue.

Furthermore, candidates must include documentation to demonstrate they have not just exceeded requirements in all three areas, but achieved markedly exceptional results relative to the requirements. Candidates need to be outstanding or extraordinary in all three areas of evaluation (teaching, RSCA, and service) in order to be considered for early tenure. RSCA productivity alone, without exceptional teaching and service does not qualify a candidate for early tenure.

In concurrence with University RTP policy, *candidates for early tenure are encouraged to engage in the external evaluation process according to the Academic Senate policy on External Evaluation of Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities.*

5.5.2 Early Promotion

To receive a favorable recommendation for early promotion to associate professor or full professor, a candidate must achieve a record of distinction in all three areas that clearly exceeds in substantial ways the requirements in department policies. Departments must make clear what qualifies as exceeding in substantial ways.

Furthermore, candidates must include documentation to demonstrate they have not just exceeded requirements in all three areas, but achieved markedly exceptional results relative to the requirements. Candidates need to be outstanding or extraordinary in all three areas of evaluation (teaching, RSCA, and service) in order to be considered for early promotion. RSCA productivity alone, without outstanding teaching and service, does not qualify a candidate for early promotion.

In concurrence with University RTP policy, *candidates for early promotion are encouraged to engage in the external evaluation process according to the Academic Senate policy on External Evaluation of Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities.*

Candidates for early promotion to associate professor are normally also candidates for early tenure. In rare instances, the university may decide that a candidate's achievements merit promotion to the rank of associate professor without a concomitant awarding of tenure. This decision represents the belief that a candidate has produced a body of work sufficient for promotion, but has not yet fully demonstrated the sustained record upon which tenure is based.

6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS

The CHHS RTP Policy follows the steps in the RTP process designated by the University Policy (see sections 6.0-6.10 of Policy Statement 23-24).

7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES

The CHHS RTP Policy follows the additional processes designated by the University Policy (see sections 7.0-7.6 of Policy Statement 23-24).

8.0 CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY

The CHHS RTP Policy follows the changes and amendments procedures designated by the University Policy (see sections 8.0 of Policy Statement 23-24).

Effective: Fall 2025



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS

College RTP Policy Document Approval

Effective Date: **Fall 2025**

College of Health & Human Services

Approved by the College Faculty Council (Enter date below)	Faculty Council Chair Name & Signature	Date
4/16/25	Nathan Gerard <i>Nathan Gerard</i>	6/27/25

Approved by the College Dean (Enter date below)	College Dean Name & Signature	Date
Grace Reynolds Fisher	Grace Reynolds <i>Grace Reynolds Fisher</i>	7-16-2025

Final Review by Faculty Affairs (Enter date below)	AVPFA Name & Signature	Date
5/8/25	Patricia Perez <i>Patricia Perez</i>	7/16/25

Provost Signature	Date
<i>[Signature]</i>	07/17/25

07/17/25